

6. To the extent that your company differentiates residential customers from business customers, of the total numbers projected for replication, how many would be replicated for business customers?

961,396 (97% of total for questions 6,7,8)

7. Of the total numbers projected for replication, how many would be replicated for the paging industry?

23,199 (1% of total for questions 6,7,8)

8. Of the total numbers projected for replication, how many numbers would be replicated for the reasons below:

Vanity number and/or marketing concerns (i.e., "branding"):	75%
Wrong number billing concerns:	35%
Concerns over consumer education regarding toll-free NPAs:	10%
Other:	10%

Percentages are average percentages listed on individual responses.

# Ordering & Billing Forum

Sponsored by the Alliance for  
Telecommunications Industry Solutions

290 W. Mt. Pleasant Avenue  
Room LCC 4E221  
Livingston, New Jersey  
07039  
Phone: (201) 740-7017  
FAX: (201) 740-6929

Doyle Griffin  
Moderator  
Sprint - Local  
Telecommunications Division

Don Werner  
Assistant Moderator  
AT&T

James E. Byrd  
Administrative Secretary  
Bellcore

April 28, 1995

To: SMS/800 Number Administration Committee  
(SNAC)

From: Angela Simpson, SNAC Secretary 

Subject: April 25-27, 1995 Joint SNAC/INC Meeting  
Minutes

---

Enclosed are the minutes of the Joint SNAC/INC meeting held  
on April 25-27, 1995 in Secaucus, New Jersey.

Please note that Issue 1100 titled "Interim Exhaust Relief  
Measures for 800 Numbers" and Issue 1101 titled "800  
Number Assignment Rate Reports" moved to initial closure.  
Final closure is targeted for the May 11, 1995 OBF General  
Session.

If you have any questions, please call me on 202-434-8827.

Enclosure

**OBF SNAC/ICCF INC  
Joint Meeting  
Secaucus, New Jersey  
April 25-27**

**MEETING NOTES**

The OBF SNAC and ICCF INC (Ordering & Billing Forum SMS Number Administration Committee and Industry Carriers Compatibility Forum Industry Numbering Committee) met jointly in Secaucus, New Jersey.

Linda Opacic, MCI, SNAC Co-Leader and Craig Wiseman, U S West, INC NPA Workshop Co-Chair, co-chaired this joint meeting, called the meeting to order and reviewed the proposed agenda. (Attachment 1 is a list of the meeting participants.) Points Noted, Agreements Reached and Action Items of the meeting follow.

**Points Noted:**

1. Appreciation was expressed to Bellcore for arranging the meeting.
2. Madeline Bogdan, ICCF Moderator and Bellcore welcomed the group to New Jersey and briefly reviewed administrative and procedural items including a review of the consensus process.
3. It was noted that the minutes from the last meeting do not require review since they were taken and reviewed in real-time.

**Action Items Review**

Linda reviewed the action items from the last joint INC/SNAC meeting which was held on March 7 and 8, 1995.

**Points Noted:**

1. A letter from the INC Co-Chairs regarding 888 NXX codes was reviewed (See Attachment 2).
2. It was suggested that this group should discuss and determine if 10,000 test numbers are needed by the NOF for testing purposes (see Action Item #2).
3. It was suggested that only 1,000 numbers in each code (800 & 888) should be set aside for testing.

Action Item:

1. DSMI will determine which 800 250 numbers are assigned and if they are in a range it (the range) will be defined.
2. A liaison letter will be drafted in order to determine how many test numbers in the 250 codes are needed by the NOF (INC/SNAC Co-Chairs).

Point Noted:

4. It was noted that all action items have been either completed or will be discussed further during the meeting:

**Assignment Rate Status/Projections**

Michael Wade, DSMI, distributed an 800 Number Exhaust Status as of April 17, 1995 (See Attachment 3).

Points Noted:

1. It was suggested that the report indicates an increase in the quantity of WORKING numbers. It was also suggested that there has been an increase in the quantity of 800 numbers RESERVED.

**OBF Issue 1100 (INC Issue #047)  
Interim Exhaust Relief Measures for 800 Numbers**

Linda briefly reviewed OBF Issue 1100 (INC Issue #047) - Interim Exhaust Relief Measures for 800 Numbers, and noted that related discussion is expected to include review Section 2 of the "Industry Guidelines for 800 Number Administration" for interim modification (e.g., reservation limits, aging status definition). The conservation options discussed at the last meeting were reviewed.

Points Noted:

1. It was noted by Dan Winters, SMT, that changes to percentages in SMS are table driven, applied to an entity and can be accommodated by modifying the table(s).

2. It was suggested that there is a need to examine the percentage at which the industry is functioning, (8%) and drop the threshold level to 8% while in a conservation mode.
3. It was suggested that when the conservation mode is no longer needed the 15% would again be applicable.
4. It was suggested that the fixed quantity of numbers (1,000) that can be reserved should be lowered to 500 while in a conservation mode.
5. It was suggested that lowering the reservation threshold levels to 500 numbers or 8% of the total quantity of 800 numbers will not provide significant number conservation and move out the projected exhaust in October 1995.
6. It was suggested that the reservation threshold levels could be changed at some future date. If changed now, such a change could adversely impact the ability of some companies to do business. In response, notification 60 days prior to the effective date was suggested.
7. It was suggested that if there is a sudden surge in reservation levels the proposed reservation threshold changes could be panic control measures. It was suggested that some type of message should be sent to the SMS user before the threshold limit is reached.
8. It was noted that INC has agreed that the full INC body does not require review of decisions reached at joint INC/SNAC meetings.
9. It was noted that CLC has determined SNAC will make decisions regarding the 800 guidelines with INC input. It was noted that the OBF guidelines include processes for expediting issue resolutions.
10. SMT noted that some RESP ORGs have requested that the 1,000 number limit is of concern and should be raised. They are, however, not in attendance.
11. It was noted that the industry must be notified 30 days prior to Final Closure of an OBF issue. However, Issue #1100 could potentially reach Final Closure on May 11, 1995 at OBF with expedited procedures.

#### Action Items:

3. Dan Winters, SMT, will be sure that RESP ORGs not in attendance are notified of any resolution to Issue #1100. He will inform RESP ORGs to contact the ATIS Secretary, Angela Simpson, for copies of these notes.

4. DDMI will forward a RESP ORG list to ATIS to assure that all RESP ORGs receive copies of these meeting notes.
5. DDMI will verify how many companies will be impacted if the reservation limit is lowered to 500 numbers.

**Points Noted:**

12. It was suggested that when consensus is reached, on the threshold levels, it must be clear to SMT that the issue is expected to reach Final Closure on May 11, 1995 at OBF General Session and that no further INC discussion will be needed.
13. It was suggested that there is a need to lower the reservation percentage to the lowest possible level.
14. It was suggested that Issue #1100 should not be closed based solely on reservation threshold limit changes.
15. A list of proposed additional reservation conservation measures were proposed and documented on Attachment 4.

**Agreements Reached:**

1. Agreement was reached to change the reservation threshold percentage from 15% to 8% of an entity's total working quantity of 800 Service Numbers.
2. Agreement was reached that SMT and DDMI will notify the RESP ORGs when they are above the new thresholds (30 days before implementation of the new proposal) (In addition, as an entity approaches new thresholds, they will be notified systematically after the July 1 process is implemented.) Note: All entities have prior notice to bring the reservation numbers down to the defined limits.

**Points Noted:**

16. The number limitation will be re-addressed later in the meeting.
17. The letter to NANPA regarding 800 NXXs assigned and/or reserved for the Caribbean countries was reviewed.
18. Mark Neptune, Trescom, noted that the companies in the Caribbean using 800 NXX codes should have been consulted. A number of companies in that area

are very heavy 800 Service users. It was noted that 800 740 is not reserved, but is in use.

19. It was suggested that instead of impacting existing business in the Caribbean, this group should look to reclaiming numbers not in use elsewhere in the SMS (RESERVED numbers). In response, it was noted that the group did not intend to attempt to reclaim any 800 resource that is in use. The effort was meant to address spare resources.
20. It was suggested that this group should review any letter(s) sent by NANPA to the Caribbean Administrations. In response, it was suggested that a new letter to NANPA be drafted that more clearly states what was intended with the earlier letter.

#### Action Item:

6. The Co-Chairs and Mark Neptune will draft a letter to NANPA clearly stating their assistance is needed in respect to 800 number exhaust as it relates to spare 800 resources designated for the Caribbean. This letter will be sent to clarify the earlier correspondence to NANPA.

#### Points Noted:

21. It was noted that a call has been placed to NANPA and a response to the following is expected:
  - Has the original letter been received by NANPA?
  - Has any action been taken on the letter and if yes, are there any answers?
22. It was noted that the document used at the last INC/SNAC meeting reflected 4 reserved 800 NXXs for the 809 area and one is actually in use (800 740).
23. The conservation option outlining alternatives for allocation of a percent, per day, per entity for new NXXs was reviewed.
24. It was suggested that there is a need to address which new 800 NXX codes might be available prior to deciding how to allocate them.

#### Agreement Reached:

3. Agreement was reached to open the 800 N11 codes for assignment (does not include 011 and 111).

Points Noted:

25. Concerns were expressed regarding potential liabilities associated with the 911 NXX if it is opened for 800 Service. In addition, concerns related to use of any 911 number for other than emergency services were expressed from a public policy and regulatory perspective.
26. It was suggested that use of 911 as an 800 number should not cause concerns related to emergency services since it is unlikely that anyone would dial 1 + 800 + 911 + XXXX for emergency assistance.
27. It was suggested that if 800 911 XXX is dialed, a vacant code announcement should be applied.

Agreement Reached:

4. It was agreed that the 800 911 NXX will not be opened for assignment.

Action Item:

7. The draft letter to NOF (See Action Item 2) will also include a recommendation that the appropriate treatment be applied whenever any 800 911 number is dialed.

Points Noted:

28. Paul Gibson, SNET, presented a proposal for assignment of new 800/888 type numbers (See Attachment 5). It suggests that a set quantity of new numbers per minute could be assigned.
29. It was suggested that there is no historical data within SMS/800 on which to further examine the proposal.
30. It was suggested that there may be development required to implement the proposal for a small quantity of 800 number assignments.
31. Concerns were expressed related to mechanized access, transaction stacking and access to numbers recently made available for assignment.
32. It was suggested that the 800 N11 codes (excluding 911) should not be opened until after July 1, 1995 at a rate of one NXX per week. This date should be coincident with agreed to changes in the reservation threshold limits/levels.



33. It was suggested that the limits should only be applied for the first few hours following availability of a new 800 NXX.
34. Concerns were expressed regarding SMS capabilities and the ability to show numbers as WORKING when they may not be working. These concerns were linked to the proposal to open the N11 codes coincident with the reservation threshold changes. It was suggested that the threshold changes will not impact the rate at which the numbers within the new codes are used.
35. It was suggested that the N11 codes should be opened but no announcement should be made.

**Agreement Reached:**

5. Agreement was reached that the 800 N11 Codes (except 911) will not be open prior to July 1, 1995.

**Points Noted:**

36. It was suggested that the 800 N11 codes should be open for assignment 60 days after July 1, 1995 since most providers will be at 8% for number reservations and that should be enough for 60 days.
37. Regarding the NANP a letter to clarify the 809 800 NXX issue, Madeline noted that Ron Conners (NANPA) returned her call and indicated that a letter has gone out and that they (NANPA) did not have proper response time and therefore requested a response from the Caribbean countries by May 1. Madeline asked Ron to fax a copy of his correspondence to the INC/SNAC.
38. It was suggested to open the N11 codes by September 1, 1995 (This will allow entities to reach 8% threshold level)
39. It was suggested that if RESP ORGS are comfortable with 8% of numbers in reserve on July 1, it would be appropriate to roll out N11s on September 1.
40. It was suggested that waiting until September 1 doesn't address the conservation issue, rather it suggests rationing and does not extend the 800 resource.
41. It was suggested that consumers may have a problem with all of these options because RESP ORGs have to choose which customers to serve and suggested letting the resource run out without conservation and that when they run out will be best for customers.

42. It was suggested that opening N11s at the rate of 1 per week does not extend the life of the 800 resource, regardless of reservation thresholds established on the dates of July 1 or September 1.
43. It was suggested that July 1 is preferred because that is also the date established for the 15% to 8% level of reserves.
44. It was suggested that waiting until September 1 actually does extend 800 because it delays assignment of those numbers.
45. It was noted that historically (e.g. CIC codes) the industry decided that resources were needed for companies not yet in existence and other conservation methods were used until additional resources were available.
46. MCI, in response, suggested that they thought the CIC resource conservation was anti-competitive and that resources needed to be assigned based on demand.
47. It was suggested that the CIC example is not the same scenario as 800 exhaust because it (800) also involves end-users.
48. It was noted that the example was not supposed to be exact and that MCI disagreed back then with consensus reached on CIC assignments.
49. In notes review, it was noted that the example of CICs was given because there was at least one case of conservation measures for NANP resources.
50. It was suggested that there are alternatives not yet discussed, and they may be difficult.
51. It was suggested that the purpose of the group is to extend the 800 resource as much as possible.
52. It was suggested that conservation efforts should not be at the expense of a customer today for a possible customer in the future.
53. It was suggested that the problem is that the working number base continues to grow, and that the measures this group can implement will not be enough.
54. It was suggested that there should be a level playing field as far as number assignments goes. It was suggested that a level playing field does exist and delaying numbers, as is being suggested, is at the expense of current customers.

- 55. It was suggested that "restrictions" to N11 numbers be clarified. In response, it was clarified that this meant how and when N11 codes will be opened.
- 56. It was suggested that all companies should commit to follow the assignment guidelines to avoid hoarding the newly-opened resources—no customer, no number.
- 57. During minutes review, MCI stated that they believe companies are following the guidelines.

Agreement Reached:

- 6. It was agreed to open the N11 codes on July 1, 1995.

Points Noted:

- 58. It was noted that GTE disagrees with Agreement Reached #6.
- 59. It was asked why the group is picking a specific date rather than waiting for current resource exhaust. In response, it was noted that the group is deciding now in order to not constrain assignments in the future.
- 60. It was noted that the DSMI figures do not include N11 codes.

Agreement Reached:

- 7. It was agreed to change the title of Attachment L from the March 7-8, 1995 meeting notes to "Numbering Resource Access Options." (see Attachment 6)

Points Noted:

- 61. It was asked whether RESP ORGs have a way of prioritizing customers. In response, it was suggested that assignment is first come, first served and the answer to the question is "No".

**800 NXX Codes in 809**

- 62. It was noted that a fax was received from Ron Conners, NANPA (See Attachment 7) containing a copy of the NANPA letter to the 809 regulators. Craig went over the NANPA letter to the 809 regulators, along with a background and discussion page.
- 63. It was suggested that clarification is still needed despite the letter.

- 64. It was suggested that the NANPA letter was not forwarded (copied) to the appropriate people.
- 65. It was suggested that if NANPA goes forward with their May 1 date, the 809 administrators may not have had sufficient time to consider the request before NANPA takes action.
- 66. It was suggested that methodology be formulated to track the issue.
- 67. It was suggested that the clarification letter state that the May 1 date be extended until the end of June (June 30).
- 68. It was suggested that notification is needed from NANPA to activate the codes and they should not be implemented until July.
- 69. It was suggested that the resolutions to N11 would apply to all created numbering resources as well.
- 70. It was suggested that most 809 countries have five year planning cycles, so they will hold on to their 800 resources for the near future. Therefore, they will hold on to their 800 resources until 2000 because 888 will be of little use to them.
- 71. It was suggested that it not be taken for granted that the 809 800 NXXs will be available in July.
- 72. It was suggested that retrieval of the assigned but unused NXXs from the 809 countries could be perceived as reclamation of the resource, when in fact, there are no reclamation procedures for the 800 service.
- 73. It was suggested that INC/SNAC clarify its position as asking the NANPA to explore the possibility of 800 809 NXX reclamation, not expecting it.

#### **Numbering Resource Access Options, Continued**

- 74. It was asked if there was a possibility for real-time tracking of 800 resource assignment without it being cost and labor intensive.
- 75. It was noted that no such system is currently in place, and it would be high-effort to create history files. If it was created, limits could be used approximately but not exactly across RESP ORGS.
- 76. SMT stated that they cannot claim they can or cannot do something until they know precisely what is required.

77. It was suggested that limiting NUS (number search) transactions to 10 would be manual-intensive.

Action Item:

8. SMT will investigate impacts of the agreement reached #8.

Points Noted:

78. At minutes review, it was decided that the meeting record will show all of the proposals considered by the group as Attachment 6.
79. AT&T stated that they support opening N11s on July 1 and no other alternative.

Agreement Reached:

8. The proposal "a limited quantity per entity, per NXX available for the first two hours, provided this does not impair implementation of 888 with the note: approximately 74 per entity per NXX for the first 2 hours" will remain on the list of Numbering Access Resource Options for additional consideration.

Points Noted:

80. It was suggested that 888 impact be taken into consideration when working issues.
81. MCI believes any restriction is inappropriate, impedes business, and may be anti-competitive.
82. SNET wants an equitable assignment method across all RESP ORGs.
83. MCI believes equity is in place because everyone buys from the same tariff and that limiting to 74 will restrict some access providers unnecessarily. MCI also believes that results of SNET's position inhibits MCI from doing business in the 800 arena.
84. During minutes review, MCI stated there is no issue of equality and addressing equity diverts attention from the real problem of resource exhaust.
85. During minutes review it was noted that Stentor Telephone Companies depend completely on MCI and have no manual option.

86. AT&T expressed that it supports MCI. Tariffs, guidelines and the rules of today provide equity. AT&T also believes that the INC/SNAC is building artificial barriers to the 800 business.
87. USTA believes that ignoring the issue of equity is inappropriate.
88. PageNet stated it cannot support any restrictions that force RESP ORGs to choose who gets an 800 number.
89. It was suggested that time could best be spent on other issues that have a greater impact on conservation.
90. It was proposed that for a specified time after opening an N11 code, all NUS be manual rather than changing the SMS.
91. AT&T suggested the group was approaching a serious anti-trust issue because AT&T purchases its service from a tariff and any restriction on it's ability to access the service would potentially be a violation of anti-trust.
92. It was proposed that all N11s be opened all at once and then limit access for a given (i.e., 2 hour) period of time.
93. USTA proposed opening the entire resource, but divide the entire resource by 135 (an equal amount to each entity).
94. MCI stated they believe that the above proposals pose a restraint on trade.
95. AT&T and Sprint do not approve of the manual-only proposal.
96. MCI stated they will not agree not to use its mechanized resource (MGI interface) voluntarily. AT&T, Sprint, and Stentor agreed.
97. It was asked if MGI users would agree not to use their mechanized interface and consider the item for further consideration.
98. It was suggested that a proposal be added that manual-entry companies have leeway before MGIs could make reservations.

**Agreement Reached:**

9. It was agreed to drop the manual proposal from the consideration list.

Points Noted:

99. The two new proposals were reviewed.
1. Open entire resource, allocate equal amount of numbers to each entity.
  2. Give manual users a head start period to acquire numbers from a new resource prior to MGI users requesting assignment.
100. In response to a question regarding the potential for tying up SMS by queuing requests for single (instead of multiple) number assignments, it was noted that this scenario is a possibility and could potentially have an impact on resource access equity if the queuing should occur.

Agreement Reached

10. It was agreed to leave on the list as an option for further review: "Open entire resource and allocate equal amount of numbers to each entity for first two hours"

Points Noted:

101. It was suggested that giving manual users a head start is a restriction.

Agreement Reached:

11. The proposal to "Give manual users a head start period to acquire numbers from a new resource prior to MGI users requesting assignment" will not be considered further and was removed from the list on Attachment 6.

Points Noted:

102. It was suggested that a decision should not be made based on the ease of SMT implementation.
103. MCI noted that they oppose any restrictions, given the current status of the tariff.
104. It was suggested that costs of SMS modification should be addressed by SNAC, given the 2 hour time frame being discussed since it will involve development.
105. It was suggested that possible tariff change, if required, may not be feasible by July 1 for Canada.

106. It was suggested that this be a SNAC issue and should be further developed there for future use.
107. It was suggested that this is an equity issue, and that equity is not the point of the INC/SNAC. Conservation is.

#### Agreement Reached

12. It was agreed not to further discuss restrictions on the N11 codes. There will be no restrictions on assignment of the N11s on July 1.

#### Points Noted:

108. SMT requested that July 1 be looked at for opening the N11 codes, as it is a holiday, and asked for a formal request to SMT from the INC/SNAC.
109. It was suggested that the date be July 5, given holiday considerations.
110. It was suggested that these minutes sufficiently fill SMT's request in point noted 108.
111. SMT suggested that a resolution statement in the minutes of the OBF will also suffice from SNAC.
112. It was suggested that Caribbean readiness considerations be taken into account.
113. It was suggested that N11 release not be contingent on the Caribbean codes being released.
114. It was suggested that other aspects of Issue 1100 be discussed (i.e., DISCONNECT plus TRANSITIONAL) and resolved. Until these aspects are discussed and resolved, Issue 1100 is not fully closed.
115. It was suggested that the N11 opening not be done on a holiday week.
116. Concerns were expressed from the West Coast over early hours implementation.
117. It was suggested that an evening effective time is preferable.



Agreement Reached:

13. 9 a.m. central daylight time on July 11, 1995 was agreed on to open the N11 codes.

Points Noted:

118. It was suggested that the July 11 agreement reached does not address fully the impacts of customer service due to system response and DSMI implementation.
119. Concerns were expressed over opening N11s in the evening because it is after-hours for the NASC and users.

Action Item:

9. All participants will determine how the 9 a.m. effective time of the 800 N11 availability in SMS impacts their companies. (Later this action item was modified).

Points Noted:

120. Concerns were expressed as to further discussing an agreement which was already reached, and thus, it was decided to stand by the agreed upon time and date to operate the N11 Codes

**Reservation Options--Fill Percentage**

121. A question was raised: In terms of conservation, how does a fill percentage limitation extend the resource?
122. It was suggested that this does not limit because valid requests will be fulfilled and is conservation.
123. It was suggested that the percentage fill proposal should be dropped by the SNAC because it is an artificial barrier.
124. It was suggested that it was a SNAC issue earlier and the proposal as defined makes it harder to do business when the system identifies a number as unavailable when it fact is available.
125. It was suggested that the 90% fill percentage is a barrier and also impacts SMS response times.

- 126. It was suggested that the philosophy behind these proposals as first presented at the Cincinnati meeting was to explore all options, and this was one of the options. The philosophy of these proposals pertained to the time when there were available resources to conserve. Such is not the case now.
- 127. It was noted that we are at the 85% threshold now.
- 128. Concerns were expressed as to the operational impacts of the percentage fill proposal (i.e., searches for specific number availability were time-consuming, cumbersome, and made it difficult to do business).

**Agreement Reached:**

- 14. It was agreed to remove the fill percentage restriction and increase percentage fill to 100% immediately.

**Points Noted:**

- 129. It was suggested that the word "immediately" be discussed.
- 130. It was noted that technically it (Agreement Reached #14) can be implemented with a phone call.
- 131. It was suggested that it be done immediately with an announcement on the SMS bulletin board to the RESP ORGs.
- 132. It was proposed that it be done one week after a letter goes out to the RESP ORGs.
- 133. It was suggested to let the SNAC issue run its course and implement it according to normal SNAC process.
- 134. It was suggested that OBF Issue item 1105 can be closed based on Agreement Reached 14.

**Agreement Reached:**

- 15. It was agreed that the fill percentage change will occur one week after OBF approval.

## **Conservation Option: DISCONNECT/TRANSITIONAL**

### **Points Noted:**

135. It was suggested that 95% fill will be reached in 15 weeks.
136. It was suggested that carriers should determine when disconnected numbers will be recycled and available for assignment (age as short as 60 days according to carrier).
137. It was suggested that flexibility is needed on both sides.
138. It was suggested that the proposal is essentially to do away with the TRANSITIONAL status in the SMS.
139. It was suggested that this was discussed at the last meeting, and it was discussed that the system default value should be changed from six to four months, but it can be overridden and changed.
140. It was suggested that this does not address the TRANSITIONAL status if less time is desired.
141. It was proposed to eliminate the TRANSITIONAL status of the SMS.
142. It was suggested that companies' ability to use numbers in TRANSITIONAL status should not be impeded.
143. It was suggested that 6 months be the default until 95% fill, then changed to 4 months.
144. It was suggested by SMT that a related SMS change would be medium-effort and costly if done by the system rather than manually. Participants were referred to Agreement Reached #4 from the March 7-8, 1995 INC/SNAC minutes, which states:

"It was agreed to limit DISCONNECT and TRANSITIONAL to a six (6) month total. It is the RESP ORGs responsibility to monitor and implement."

Further, Point Noted 38 from the March 7-8 minutes was also pointed out, which states:

"It was suggested that there is a need to weigh the impacts of SMS changes to accommodate the recommended changes to DISCONNECT and TRANSITIONAL against the SMS changes needed for 888. Limiting the DISCONNECT plus TRANSITIONAL status to 6 months will require considerable changes to SMS."

145. It was suggested that RESP ORGs need to determine on a number by number basis how long the TRANSITIONAL status needs to be.
146. It was suggested that DSMI could produce a listing on transitional numbers so RESP ORGs could investigate their numbers.
147. DSMI noted that reports can be ordered.
148. It was suggested that how the transition status is used is based on a RESP ORG's belief of individual customer's needs.
149. It was suggested in the case when a customer sought a special number through a new RESP ORG that customer would not be assigned the number if it was being held in TRANSITIONAL unless negotiated between RESP ORGs for release.

#### **Agreement Reached**

16. It was agreed that the existing process for DISCONNECT plus TRANSITIONAL system limitation remains at 6 months. RESP ORGs may choose to use time frames of 4 months up to the system limitation of 12 months, as customer/business requirements dictate. Such situations are not considered to be in conflict with the guidelines.

#### **Points Noted:**

150. It was suggested that the systematic minimum for transitional status is the key from a guidelines perspective. The guidelines originally required 6 months minimum, but could be as great as 1 year.
151. It was suggested that it does not conflict with the guidelines for individual RESP ORGs to exceed the established 4-month requirement.
152. It was noted that the system default remains 6-months and RESP ORGs can adjust theirs according to their individual circumstances.

#### **Action Item Responses-DSMI**

#### **Points Noted:**

1. It was noted by DSMI that only one company will be affected by the reservation threshold level change from 15% to 8%. DSMI also reported that the change in reservation limits from 1,000 to 500 would affect possibly only one company. However, it was noted by DSMI that the report of this one problem could not be confirmed.

2. In response to a question regarding the 250 test code, DSMI noted that the 250 test numbers are currently spread across the 800 250 code, but also suggested that they could be consolidated.
3. In response to the action item for DSMI to find out whether warnings are given, it was noted that at 97% threshold, the RESP ORGs will be warned that they are approaching the limit. At 1,000, the RESP ORGs will get an error message on the system and through the MGI.

**Agreement Reached:**

17. It was agreed to make the reservation threshold-level change from the 15% threshold to the 8% threshold effective July 1, 1995.

**Point Noted:**

4. It was suggested that the 800 250 numbers be consolidated. In response, it was noted an earlier action item has been assigned addressing 250 with NOF and will also address consolidation, as needed.

**Issue 1.00 (INC Issue #047) Interim Exhaust Relief Measures for 800 Numbers**

**Points Noted:**

153. It was noted that the DSMI report presented on April 25th (Attachment 3) includes 60 to 30 day reservation information.
154. It was suggested that the RESERVE date change will magnify current internal problems.

**Agreement Reached:**

18. It was agreed not to change the 60 day time period for reservations.

**Points Noted:**

155. Attachment I from the March 7-8 INC/SNAC Minutes regarding early reservation of 888 was discussed. It was suggested that it would be discussed later if someone champions this issue at the SNAC meeting, as it is not a conservation method.

**Agreement Reached:**

19. It was agreed to open the unavailable NXXs with LERG restrictions/45 days and no earlier than July 11, if these codes become available.

20. The following agreement was reached regarding Issue 1100:

Each RESP ORG can have up to 1,000 numbers reserved or 8% of an entity's total working quantity of 800 service numbers, whichever is greater.

SMT and DSMI will notify the RESP ORGs when they are above the new thresholds (30 days before implementation of the new proposal which was agreed to July 1.) In addition, as an entity approaches new thresholds they will be notified systematically after the July 1st process is implemented.

NOTE: All entities have prior notice to bring the reservation numbers down to the defined limits. Also note that the systematic notification begins at 97% of the threshold.

A letter is being referred to the NOF for action requesting that test numbers be consolidated into 250-0000 through 250-0999. Upon NOF concurrence and notification, the remainder of the NXX will be made available. It was agreed to open the unavailable 250 numbers no earlier than July 11.

Our recommendation to NOF is to have the same test numbers for 888. (i.e., 888-250-0000 to 888-250-0999).

Per INC input the SNAC agreed to hold 555-0199 for this purpose. It was agreed that the following numbers: 555-0100 to 555-0198, will be made at the same time as the N11, which is July 11.

It was agreed to increase percentage fill to 100% with no restrictions one week after the OBF meeting. The approval is anticipated on May 11.

It was agreed that the existing process for disconnect and transitional system limitation remains at 6 months. RESP ORGs may voluntarily choose to use time frames of 4 months up to the system limitation 12 months as customer/business requirements dictate; such situations are not considered to be in conflict with the guidelines.

It was agreed that DSMI will notify all RESP ORGs of the above conservation measures agreed upon.

It was agreed that the reservation time frame will remain at 60 days.

**Resolution:**

The following conservation measures have been identified:

Reservation Limits: The Agreement Reached number 20 will be included on the Issue

Statement of Issue 1100.

Opening up the unavailable NXX codes:

It was agreed to open up all N11 codes \*on July 11, 1995 at 9:00 a.m. (\*with the exception of 911) with no restrictions.

The Caribbean correspondence continues and if these codes become available, it was agreed to open the unavailable NXXs with LERG restrictions (45 days) and no earlier than July 11.

This agreement will be added as the resolution to Issue #1100.

21. It was agreed to accept Issue 1100 for initial closure.

**Points Noted:**

1. It was suggested that the topic of early reservation of 888 numbers is not a topic for discussion by the joint INC/SNAC. A separate issue related to 888 implementation should be raised and submitted to OBF as agreed to at the last joint meeting on March 7-8, 1995.
2. It was noted that OBF Issue 1117 is not intended to address early reservation of 888.

**OBF Issue 1101 (INC Issue #048)  
800 Number Assignment Rate Reports**

Linda briefly reviewed OBF Issue 1101 (INC Issue #048) 800 Number Assignment Rate Reports and noted that related discussion is expected to include

- review current reports available
- parameters, timing and monitoring by SNAC & INC
- benchmarks for implementation of interim procedures
- meeting timeframes, communication process, what triggers changes in phases, notification, etc.

**Points Noted:**

1. Michael Wade, DSML, noted that page 4 of Attachment 3 lists the available SMS reports. The two industry-wide reports can be made available on a weekly basis. Currently, the "CSB" is produced monthly and the percentage used report is provided on demand.

2. It was noted that the INC NPA Workshop would like the CSB report sent to them.
3. It was suggested that it would be helpful if the report could define the quantity of numbers rolling over from DISCONNECT to TRANSITIONAL. Michael advised that this type of information is not available since it would require status tracking for each 800 number.

**Action Item:**

10. DSI will investigate the impacts of applying the logic used for the Number Administration Summary Report to all reports.

**Agreement Reached:**

22. Agreement was reached that the Industry Number Administration Summary Report will be produced weekly and forwarded to the INC Secretary and to the primary contacts at each RESP ORG organization.

This will be forwarded weekly until the new NPA (888) is available, at which point the report will be forwarded monthly.

**Points Noted:**

4. It was noted that the SMS software fixes related to earlier problems with numbers in the TRANSITIONAL status have been implemented.
5. It was suggested that discussion needs to take place relative to report distribution on a going forward basis. In addition, there is a need to develop guidelines that set criteria for triggers on future potential exhaust scenarios.
6. It was noted that the report agreed to earlier will be reviewed by INC at each meeting, as appropriate, and it was suggested that INC monitor 800 and 888 assignment rates on a going forward basis.
7. It was suggested that INC does not currently have an issue to address guidelines for triggers as future 800/888 exhaust scenarios approach. It should be suggested that the issue might include the following concepts:
  - toll free resources should not exhaust
  - relief should be scheduled when there is no greater than 90% utilization of the current resource
  - conservation modes should not be considered unless the relief date surpasses the exhaust date
  - and 18 months notice should be given prior to turn up of a new NPA



8. It was suggested that the criteria/parameters developed by INC may need to be incorporated in the 800 guidelines handled by OBF SNAC. In response, it was suggested that INC would need to address the network aspects of such criteria and SNAC the SMS aspects.

Agreement Reached:

23. The following resolution statement was agreed to for Issue #1101:

Resolution:

For the duration of the exhaust situation, it was agreed that the Number Administration Summary Report be distributed weekly via normal distribution for the CSB. In addition, the report will be sent to the INC Secretary. Once the NPA (888) is available, the report will be published on a monthly basis to the same distribution list.

Points Noted:

9. It was suggested that the criteria INC needs to develop should provide instruction to NANPA when to assign a new NPA for exhaust relief. It should also include the criteria/parameters for network readiness for a new toll free NPA. The referral to INC could be accomplished via a response to INC's earlier referral of INC Issue #047-049.
10. Concerns were expressed regarding the amount of time that may be needed for the potential exhaust relief of 888.

Agreement Reached:

24. Agreement was reached to forward the following concepts to the (appropriate open issue) INC along with a suggestion that INC develop criteria/parameters for monitoring 800/888 resource utilization in respect to future exhaust planning.

Reporting system that constantly reports utilization and then INC can decide when conservation/relief can go into effect.

- When do we want to plan relief?
- Implementation of the availability of the new NPA codes to be completed, for example, no later than 90% fill.
- The planning cycle should be implemented within enough time to meet the 90% fill.